



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/073,618	02/11/2002	Jian Cao	MSFT-0767/186581.1	4512
41505 7590 10/19/2007 WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR 2929 ARCH STREET PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891			EXAMINER BILGRAMI, ASGHAR H	
			ART UNIT 2143	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/19/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/073,618

Applicant(s)

CAO ET AL.

Examiner

Asghar Bilgrami

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 11 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilling (U.S. Pub No 2003/0182447 A1) and Davallou (U.S. 6,976,019 B2).

3. As per claims 1, 15-18, 36, 38, 39, 40, 55-57 & 58 Schilling disclosed a computing system, a method for providing runtime automatic universal resource locator (URL) analysis and suggestion in connection with a service accessed from a client computing device utilizing a URL input mechanism, comprising: inputting URL input to the URL input mechanism of the client computing device (page.2, paragraphs.10 & 16). However Schilling did not explicitly disclose determining whether the URL input is valid and if invalid, detecting whether said input is likely candidate for multilingual analysis, and if said input is a likely candidate for said multilingual analysis, transmitting said URL input to a server computing device for intelligent rules-based analysis, including said multilingual analysis (col.6, lines 7-50), and identification of the invalid URL input; transforming the invalid aspects of the invalid URL and outputting at least one valid

Art Unit: 2143

alternative URL based upon said analysis, and suggesting at least one of the alternative URL.

In the same filed of endeavor Davallou disclosed determining whether the URL input is valid (col.2, lines 30-54) and if invalid, detecting whether said input is likely candidate for multilingual analysis (col.3, lines 38-62), transmitting said URL input to a server computing device for intelligent rules-based analysis of the invalid URL input; transforming the invalid aspects of the invalid URL (col.13, lines 48-67 & col.4, lines 1-28) and outputting at least one valid alternative URL based upon said analysis, and suggesting at least one of the alternative URL (col.6, lines 7-50).

It would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated determining URL validation and the rules based URL correction as disclosed by Davallou in a computing system utilizing a URL input mechanism disclosed by Schilling in order to provide and promote most likely or accurate URL matches to the user resulting in creating an environment that is user friendly and facilitates the user in their URL search task.

4. As per claims 2, 21 & 43 Schilling-Davallou disclosed a method according to claim 1, wherein the at least one database of known URLs includes a dynamically updated database of current URLs (Schilling, paragraphs.17, 19 & 26).

5. As per claims 3, 22 & 44 Schilling-Davallou disclosed a method according to claim 1, wherein the at least one database of known URLs includes a top URL list checked before any other database (Schilling, paragraphs.17, 19 & 26).

6. As per claims 4, 23 & 45 Schilling-Davallou disclosed a method according to claim 3, wherein the at least one database of known URLs includes secondary list which is analyzed after the top URL list if at least one alternative URL is not found based on an analysis of the top URL list (Schilling, paragraphs.17, 19 & 21).

7. As per claims 5, 24 & 46 Schilling-Davallou disclosed a method according to claim 4, wherein the at least one database of known URLs includes a complete list of URLs which is analyzed after the secondary list if at least one alternative URL is not found based on an analysis of the secondary list (Schilling, paragraphs.17, 19 & 21).

8. As per claims 6, 19 & 20 Schilling-Davallou disclosed a method according to claim 1, further including preprocessing the URL input to at least one of (1) remove non-domain name service (DNS) characters (2) to replace non-DNS characters and (3) to correct an error in protocol (Schilling, Page.3, paragraphs. 23, 24 & 27).

9. As per claims 7, 25 & 47 Schilling-Davallou disclosed a method according to claim 1, wherein the client device includes a browser and the URL input is URL input

intended for one of navigation to a Web site and search on a Web site (Schilling, page.2, paragraph.16).

10. As per claims 8, 26 & 48 A method according to claim 1, further including displaying the suggested alternative URLs to the user via an error page (Schilling, page.3, paragraph.24).

11. As per claims 9, 27 & 49 Schilling-Davallou disclosed a method according to claim 8, further including performing a search with the URL input as a query and displaying the results of the search on the error page (Schilling, page.3, paragraphs. 23 & 24).

12. As per claims 10, 28, 37 & 50 Schilling-Davallou disclosed a method according to claim 8, further including displaying a link on the client computing device error page, which link, if input by the user, retries the original URL input (Schilling, page.3, paragraph.24).

13. As per claims 11, 29 & 51 Schilling-Davallou disclosed a method according to claim 8, further including tracking user behavior in response to the display of the error (Davallou, col.3, lines 48-67 & col.4, lines 1-28).

14. As per claims 12, 30 & 52 Schilling-Davallou disclosed a method according to claim 55, wherein the at least one database includes URLs that are weighted according to their popularity (Schilling, page.1, paragraph.8).

15. As per claims 13, 31 & 53 Schilling-Davallou disclosed a method according to claim 1, wherein said rules based analysis includes applying rules from a rules based table (Schilling, paragraphs.17, 19 & 21).

16. As per claims 14, 32 & 54 Schilling-Davallou disclosed a method according to claim 1, wherein said rules based analysis includes applying rules to the analysis based upon said at least one known URLs database (Davallou, col.3, lines 48-67 & col.4, lines 1-28).

Response to Arguments

17. Applicant's arguments filed 9/6/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

18. Applicant argued that that Davallou always performs its analysis after URL input is determined to be invalid (col.3, lines 48-62) and Davallou fails to disclose multilingual analysis.

As to applicant's argument Davallou performs its analysis after URL input is determined to be invalid not before. As to applicant's argument Davallou discloses that

Art Unit: 2143

if a user looking for a particular keyword/website (URL), and key word/s s/he entered does not match any data existent on the database/web, the engine would perform a second search with words that best match the sound of the typed word/s in the user language (or various languages) (I.E multilingual) (col.5, lines 31-58) to see if more accurate match can be found in the database/web (col.3, lines 48-62). The World Wide Web contains numerous web sites in French, Spanish, German and Russian etc with similar URL address field. As an example examiner suggests applicant to go to a Spanish web address <http://www.pcrm.org/health/veginfo/spanishvsk/index.html> . On the address field and on the web page please note that the spellings of the words are different (since it is a different language) hence it would have been obvious to one in the ordinary skill in the art to implement Davallou teachings on multilingual web sites. Davallou specifically states, "Additional modifications and improvements of the present invention may also be apparent to those of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, the particular combination of parts described and illustrated herein is not intended to serve as limitations of the alternative devices within the spirit and scope of the invention.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asghar Bilgrami whose telephone number is 571-272-3907. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3924. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



AB



DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100